

24. (New) The system as recited in claim 13, wherein the primitive function request mechanism is adapted for returning one or more identifiers associated with one or more of the set of primitive functions to one of the set of services in response to a primitive request sent by the one of the set of services.

## REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the claims under 35 USC §102. These rejections are fully traversed below. The claims have been amended to clarify the subject matter being claimed. In addition, claims 23-24 have been added. Claims 1-24 are now pending.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

### REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 USC §102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Preisler et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,675,803, ('Preisler' hereinafter). This rejection is fully traversed below.

Preisler relates to a method and apparatus for a fast debugger fix and continue operation. See title. A user can begin a debugging session, and if an error in the code is encountered, the user can edit the corresponding source code to correct the error and then execute a "Fix and Continue" command all without leaving the debugging session. The Fix and Continue code calls the compiler to recompile the source code file with the edited text in it, receives the resulting compiled object code file from the compiler, uses the dynamic linker to link the recompiled object code into the target application process, patches the previous version of this same object code file to refer to the newly recompiled code, resets any required variables and registers, and resets the program counter to the line of code being executed when the error was discovered. See Abstract.

With respect to claim 1, as amended, Preisler neither discloses nor suggests “sending a request for requesting a primitive function from one of the set of system services to another one of the set of system services, the primitive function replicating the one of the set of system services in a manner such that implementation of the primitive function reduces or eliminates reliance on one or more system functions capable of becoming non-functional in the event of a system error.” Moreover, Preisler neither discloses nor suggests “sending receiving an identifier associated with the requested primitive function from at the one of the set of system services from another one of the set of system services, thereby enabling the one of the set of system services to call the primitive function via the identifier associated with the requested primitive function.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 22 are patentable over Preisler.

With respect to claim 4, as amended, Preisler neither discloses nor suggests “sending a primitive function request for a primitive function down from one of the layers of the stack of system services to another one of the layers in the stack of system services, the primitive function replicating the system service associated with the one of the layers in the stack.” In addition, Preisler neither discloses nor suggests “when the another one of the layers is responsible for performing at least one of input and output, returning a primitive function identifier associated with the primitive function to the one of the layers of the stack of system services.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 is patentable over Preisler.

With respect to claim 7, as amended, Preisler neither discloses nor suggests “sending a primitive function request for a primitive function down from a first one of the layers in the stack of system services to a second one of the layers in the stack of system services, the primitive function replicating the system service associated with the second one of the layers in the stack of system services in a manner such that implementation of the primitive function reduces or eliminates reliance on one or more system functions capable of becoming non-functional in the event of a system error.” Similarly, Preisler neither discloses nor suggests “returning primitive function information associated with the primitive function to the first one of the layers.” In addition, Preisler neither discloses nor suggests “storing the primitive function information to enable the first one of the layers in the stack of system services to communicate with the primitive function associated with the second one of the layers in the stack of system services.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7 and 23 are patentable over Preisler.

With respect to claim 13, Preisler neither discloses nor suggests “a set of primitive functions associated with the set of services, the set of primitive functions replicating the set of services, wherein each of the set of primitive functions eliminates or reduces reliance on one or more system functions that are capable of becoming non-functional in the event of a system error with reduced functionality.” In addition, Preisler neither discloses nor suggests “a primitive function request mechanism adapted for returning one or more identifiers associated with one or more of the set of primitive functions.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 is allowable.


In view of the above, it is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over the cited references. The dependent claims depend from one of the independent claims and are therefore patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons. However, the dependent claims recite additional limitations that further distinguish them from the cited references. The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed as the above discussed limitations are clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims under 35 USC §102.

Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0388 (Order No. SUN1P376).

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER, WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Elise R. Heilbrunn  
Reg. No. 42,649

BEYER, WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

P.O. Box 778  
Berkeley, California 94704  
Tel. (510) 843-6200